UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,402	07/01/2008	Erich Josef Windhab	3712036-00742	1485
29157 K&L Gates LLI	7590 11/17/201 P	1	EXAMINER	
P.O. Box 1135 CHICAGO, IL	60600		LEFF, STEVEN N	
CIIICAGO, IL	00090		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1782	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/17/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chicago.patents@klgates.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/597,402	WINDHAB ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
STEVEN LEFF	1782	

	STEVEN LEFF	1782	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	ess
THE REPLY FILED 31 October 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, whi with 37 CFR 41.31; or (ich places the 3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropriate nally set in the final Office.	e extension fee action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the a	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT N); eer form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying the	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Con		•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14-29.		be entered and an exp	lanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fails t	
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:			
/Rena L. Dye/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1782			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant's amendments to claim 1, specifically the newly added limitation such that process comprises locally adjusting, in at least 3 zones of the extruder screw, and more specifically such that width variation of cuts in a screw flight provide a viscosity-adapted increase in shear treatment in a first 25% to 70% of a length of the extruder measured from an extruder inlet such that after about half or two-thirds of the extruder length a freezing degree of greater than 55% to 60% frozen water fraction related to the freezable water is reached raise new issues which would require further consideration and search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the process comprising locally adjusting, in at least 3 zones of the extruder screw, width variation of cuts in a screw flight, the process providing a viscosity-adapted increase in shear treatment in a first 25% to 70% of a length of the extruder measured from an extruder inlet such that after about half or two-thirds of the extruder length a freezing degree of greater than 55% to 60% frozen water fraction related to the freezable water is reached) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

.